

NE94 Telephone Follow-up Overview

Fishery managers are required by law to report the economic consequences of their decisions regarding the allocations of limited fish resources between commercial and recreational fishing sectors. High quality economic data are needed to evaluate the economic claims of constituents and to resolve potential political conflicts between the commercial and recreational fishing constituents as they compete for the limited fish resources. However, fishery managers do not currently have access to much economic information about recreational fisheries. This study intends to help fill the data and research gaps in our knowledge of the economics of marine recreational fishing.

Our objectives, broadly characterized, are twofold. The first is to collect social and economic data on the people who participate in marine recreational fishing in the various regions of the continental United States. Second, these data will be used to estimate statistical models of the demand for marine recreational fishing for seven to nine regionally selected species that are highly sought by marine recreational anglers and are either currently managed by the Fishery Management Councils and/or the Interstate Marine Fisheries Commissions, or are expected to come under management in the near future. For example, the 1994 Supplemental Economic Survey conducted in the Northeast Region as an add-on to the Marine Recreational Fisheries Statistics Survey (MRFSS) asked about bluefish, striped bass, summer flounder, Atlantic cod, black sea bass, tautog, scup, and weakfish (scup was targeted in the North Atlantic and weakfish in the Middle Atlantic).

The species-specific demand models (travel cost models and random utility models) will be specified to begin to answer questions about the economic value of or costs of two common forms of regulations imposed on anglers: (1) participation and access and (2) changes in catch (e.g., creel limits, catch and release, minimum size). In keeping with the state of the art in recreational demand modeling, the demand models will be estimated as being contingent on the choice to go marine recreational fishing and the choice of target species. This study will not estimate economic impact statistics, including multiplier effects for regional income or employment. Although, some of the data we collect could be used by others for this purpose (particularly data on anglers' expenditures), credible regional economic impact analysis requires an entirely different survey methodology. The focus of this large scale data collection and research project will be on the economic valuation of marine recreational fishing and catches by anglers.

Telephone Follow-Up to Intercept Survey Instrument

The economics telephone follow-up is designed to elicit additional social and economic information from anglers who completed the add-on economics survey. The questionnaire targets two distinct groups of anglers: (1) anglers who target--not merely catch--the selected seven to nine species of interest, and (2) anglers who targeted other species but happened to catch any of the seven to nine designated species. The questionnaires solicit social and economic data, as well as information about recreational fishing avidity, attitudes, and experience. These data will be used to develop angler profiles and to estimate statistical models of the decision to target a selected species.

Therefore, validation interviews to be conducted with economic follow-up volunteers should be administered during the telephone follow-up contact such that the validation interview precedes the follow-up interview. Individuals at least 16 years of age are eligible to respond to the add-on telephone survey. We believe responses from individuals less than 16 years old will not be valid and reliable within the objectives of the study. In addition, because of the personalized nature of some of the questions, proxy respondent-based reporting will not be allowed. It is understood that proxy respondents generally range from 15 to 20 percent of the total sample of 2 month fishing households. Further sampling controls based on gender will not be needed.

General Procedures

The telephone follow-up is designed to collect data which is not trip-specific and does not require immediate questioning of the respondent for accurate recall; these data shall be coded to match the identification code (state, site, date, and ID_CODE) of the MRFSS intercepted trip. Contingent upon the

release of name and phone number, an attempt shall be made to telephone individuals who indicate they would be willing to participate in a follow-up telephone survey (including multiple members of households). Only the anglers who were intercepted in the MRFSS should be interviewed; proxy respondent-based reporting is not valid within the context of the follow-up questionnaire. If after reading the introductory paragraph to the follow-up, it becomes obvious that the respondent has been previously interviewed about another trip (in a different wave or even within the same wave), an abbreviated version of the questionnaire will be used. Appropriate coding must be incorporated to allow the linkage of the records of these multiple interviews. Different versions of the telephone follow-up will be used based on target behavior, sub-region, state and random selection of specific question parameters. Two versions of Questions 1-2 vary by whether intercept target activity exists or not. The hypothetical bag limit questions, Q.12-13, have different versions varying by sub-region and the magnitude of the proposed change. The different versions and random species insertions shall be administered sequentially, based on a randomized starting point, across waves and states within a sub-region.

A `Aversion@`variable must be included in the data to document which of the different versions of each question -where appropriate- is utilized. To minimize recall bias, anglers should be contacted within 3 weeks of the time when they were intercepted.

Interview Justification

Each Question in the telephone follow-up will be used for the same purposes as the Questions in the add-on intercept survey. However, this information will provide further insights into angler attitudes, experiences, and travel behavior necessary for state of the art demand modeling.

Data Sets

Data sets can be obtained by contacting the National Marine Fisheries Service, Science and Technology division.

Administrative Statistics

Table 14: Interviews by Telephone Validation Potential

1994	Respondent has home phone								Gave a phone number			
	Yes		No		Unknown		Refused		Yes		No	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
North Atlantic	14067	97.9	243	1.7	44	0.3	14	0.1	11677	81.3	2691	18.7
Mid-Atlantic	21095	98.2	303	1.4	47	0.2	35	0.2	17877	83.2	3603	16.8
North East	35162	98.05	546	1.55	91	0.25	49	0.15	29554	82.25	6294	17.75

Table 15: Validation Dialing Results for 1994, North Atlantic

1994	Total Number Dialed	Verification Results								
		Non- Working Number	Business- Not There	Business - Gone	Home- Not There	Home- Gone	No Contact- 4 Attempts	Initial Refusal	Communi- cation Barrier	Spoke W/ Angler
North Atlantic	1443	72	13	0	77	21	359	21	5	875
Mid-Atlantic	1985	101	22	2	129	23	545	25	6	1132
North East	3428	173	35	2	206	44	904	46	11	2007